

Vol. XIV No. 1

Fall 1991

Creation

Social Science

and Humanities

QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

ISSN 0740-3399

Cover Art by E. Sue Paar

EDITORIAL

The War Against Abortion Will Not Go Away Because Abortion is a Reality Issue

The war being waged against America's aborting of preborn babies will not go away. The war against abortion will not stop because America's abortion policy is a war on reality. Abortion is an issue like slavery, apartheid, or genocide. The brute inhumanity, self-centeredness, and barbarity of it—the naked disregard of the Law of God inherent in abortion—must eventually break through to the consciences, and then to the courageousness, of only a few at first, perhaps, but then more and more repentant individuals who can never turn back or let the issue die away until the society is either restored to decency and sanity or destroyed by its own wickedness.

Some "pro-choice" individuals are positively wicked, but most are as kind and decent in general terms as their "pro-life" counterparts. Nevertheless, the pro-abortion cause is a war on reality, and the actions of abortion proponents show that they know it. Their knowing war on reality is evidenced when they keep their eyes from seeing and their minds from thinking about what really happens in an abortion. Their knowing war on reality is evidenced when they avoid using the term "baby" when discussing abortion. Their knowing war on reality is evidenced when they cannot acknowledge a balance of sympathy between a mother—perhaps caught in a desperate and gut-wrenching situation—and her baby, whose life is to be painfully and brutally stolen away.

In the battle to stop the baby killing and end the abortion holocaust, the "pro-life" forces may have few allies—certainly not the media; certainly not the power brokers of Wall Street; certainly not the academic elite. Certainly we do not have the political clout in Washington to end the nightmare. But one ally we do have is *reality*. We can squarely face what goes on in an abortion mill, and we can also face the hard reality of pregnant mothers caught in desperate situations and needing help. We can face the reality of the astounding scientific revolution in our understanding of fetal development and life inside the womb from the moment of conception. For the "pro-lifer" there is no psychic need for mental and moral gymnastics; for the "pro-lifer" a baby is a baby.

The War Against Abortion Will Not Go Away Because Abortion is a Biblical Creation Issue

Moral values originate in the Person of the Transcendent, Supernatural God of the Bible. Man originated as an act of creation by God. God created man in His own image and likeness. Since man received life by God's creation, his right to life is a moral value, absolute because God-given, and forfeitable only under God's

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Fall 1991)

terms as set forth in His Word. All man's offspring are included as having this right. At their creation God blessed man, both male and female, charging them to be fruitful and multiply and to have dominion over the earth.¹ Proponents of abortion will never be able to eradicate these beliefs about God, Creation, and man created in God's image and likeness as the foundation of a baby's right to life. The war to end abortion will not go away because abortion violates the heart and soul of biblical revelation from the first chapter of Genesis. The war to end abortion will not go away because "the word of our God stands forever" (Isaiah 40:8).

Paul Ackerman

References

1. Paragraph adapted from Ellen Myers, "Man's Right to Life, Self-Sacrifice, and the Image of God," Fall 1984 *CSSHQ*, p. 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO OUR MEMBERS/SUBSCRIBERS

SUBSCRIPTION AND MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS DUE

Subscription and membership renewals are due in September 1991. Please send in your subscription and/or membership renewal now for the coming publishing year (Volume 14 of the *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, September 1991 through August 1992). Subscription and membership fees are \$15.00 within the USA, \$20.00 outside the the USA.

If you have already sent in your subscription/membership renewal, please disregard this notice. Thank you.

LETTERS

Dear Editor:

I have been studying creationist materials for several years now, since I read Dr. Huse's book, *The Collapse of Evolution*. The excitement that I express is likely so common to you that I only include it "for the record" so to speak.

The hunger that I have for creationist information is so deep that it is closer to pain than pleasure. I suppose that this is so because of the years of being denied the truths of the world we live in. For many years I have had no real input from the life sciences or earth sciences because they are so tainted with evolution dogma and speculation that it took the joy out of even well-made documentaries and publications. I feel I need to catch up on an old void of information on the wonderful world around me. I don't know if I ever can.

I feel cheated by the media, the intellectual community, and by the education system, and it makes me angry. These highly paid institutions and doctors have spent decades obscuring the facts—and for what? I have a feeling their judgment will be a personal sense of the ignorance that they have left for us in our society.

As for myself, I can't seem to get enough of information on teleology, young earth data, and flood evidences. And yet I recall that God's love transcends knowledge and brings me greater peace than trying to fill in the heritage of knowledge that society has delayed but could not deny me.

David Siemens
Box 32, Rae, N.W.T. Canada XOE OYO

Dear Editor:

I was grateful to read the article by Eve Lewis Perera, "Madness As A Tool Of The New Creation." I was especially moved to read the author also experienced the very madness she wrote about. I remember well the days when I was "locked up" and roomed with someone strapped down, constantly screaming and urinating on himself. My diagnosis was bleak at the time, but now I can see how God meant it all for the good. I remember well those most trying years of recovery ("Not that I have already obtained it, or have already become perfect . . .," Phil. 3:12), and always keeping in my wallet a note which I read often: "My fear is I have developed and organized a life strategy that doesn't work. Now I've forgotten how I developed it and know not how to dismantle it." I believe it's unfortunate that what Eve Perera wrote and like testimonials are "rarely" considered authentic Christian experiences. So again, I'm thankful to have read such an article.

Patrick Tenbrink
2021 N. Old Manor #303, Wichita, KS 67208

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Fall 1991)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND EVOLUTION

Carl Wieland

Many evangelical papers have expressed dismay at the thrust of the recent seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches, held in Canberra, February 7-20, 1991.

It began with an overtly pagan ceremony, and was assisted by \$1 million from the Australian Government; departure from biblical faith would be too mild a description.

A major, well-received address by a Korean woman delegate plumbed new depths of apostasy. Calling openly on various spirits of the dead, including the ancestors of her countrymen, she said these dead spirits were "agents through whom the Holy Spirit has spoken," and were "icons of the Holy Spirit." She said that "the image of the Holy Spirit comes from the image of Kwan In"—an Eastern "goddess of compassion," and "enlightened being" waiting for the whole universe, people, trees, animals and material things, to "become enlightened" and enter "Nirvana."

The timid voices of a handful of evangelicals were overwhelmed. Heated lobbying against America's war effort, and labeling Australia's stance to Aborigines as "genocidal" and "worse than South Africa" was undertaken by what *Time* magazine labeled "for the most part smart operators pushing very strong lines."

However, there is one common, dominant factor in the thinking that pervades the theology of virtually all those who support the World Council of Churches. It is the belief in evolution as truth. Such a belief implies that

(1) The Bible is, quite simply, wrong on such major issues. So how then can any appeal to what the Bible says overrule man's opinion? For instance, the Bible says there is only one way to reconciliation with God, through Jesus Christ. Yet there was a strong "push" at the WCC Assembly to unite with non-Christian religions.

(2) Whoever "god" is, he (she/it?) is not a miracle-working, all-powerful, Father-God as revealed in Scripture. Once the foundation of Genesis/Creation is abandoned, along with it goes any absolute standard. For example, the Holy Spirit can be defined any way you wish—as an Eastern goddess or as the spirits of your ancestors.

Since words such as "blasphemy," "heresy" and "apostasy" are defined in terms of departing from an absolute standard, these words become non-concepts

to those who reject the absolute standard; words such as these have no meaning if everything is relative in an evolutionary world, a world that has pulled itself up by its bootstraps, through eons of death and suffering.

(3) Since sin gets its definition in Genesis, i.e., rebellion against the revealed will or command of God, the "truth of evolution" means that sin and salvation must be redefined—perhaps in terms of socio-economic struggles.

Since the atoning blood of the Lamb only has meaning in the context of a literal Adam and a literal Fall, with the entry of death into the world only as a consequence of Adam's sin, one can be certain that in an evolutionary forum such as the WCC Assembly, the historical understanding of Jesus' atoning blood would not feature—could not feature.

(4) Genesis explains how and why man is a unique creation, made in the image of God. Thus, evolutionary theology is the reason why there was a strong push at the WCC Assembly to see everything as divine—animals, rocks, trees.

It appears that only the Orthodox Church put up a meek protest that at least the soul of man should be regarded as scripturally unique (note the implicit capitulation to man's physical evolution).

Such evolution-based "process theology" is merely a return to pagan ideas of nature worship, in which everything (especially "mother earth") is divine.

Rather than history's moving to "that day" (Christ's return and restoration of the Created Order), in evolutionary theology everything is moving (evolving) towards a state of "Nirvana" or "enlightenment." Man himself will become god-like. (Recognize the lie of the serpent? "You shall be as gods.")

Since, according to evolution, nature has created itself, it is nature, the earth, that gets the glory and the worship, and ultimately, in consistent evolutionary theology, nature (the universe) itself becomes god.

Behind WCC-type evolutionary thinking is the belief that if the universe were to vanish, along with men's thoughts, so too would "god." Diametrically and utterly opposed to this is the transcendent God of Creation. This is a watershed issue, which dramatically cuts through virtually all the others and is foundational to them.

The God of Genesis (and the rest of the Bible) is the eternal, uncreated "I AM," who transcends, exists before, and is independent of the universe and the physical laws which He created. He is not the god of "process theology," nor yet is he the impotent god most generally invoked at the WCC Assembly. He alone is to be worshipped. To substitute the creation or any of its creatures, including man, as an object of worship is an unspeakable abomination.

This is not some minor doctrinal dispute—it is a division as deep as that between the religion of Cain and the religion of Abel.

Though many do not yet recognize it, there is really a struggle to

the death going on at all levels of society, a struggle between opposing views of reality, opposing religious systems. At the foundational level, it is a battle between creation and evolution.

Editor's Note: Reprinted slightly abridged from the April 1991 *Prayer News* published by the Creation Science Foundation Ltd., P. O. Box 302, Sunnybank, Qld. 4109, Australia.

THE PASCAL CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN FAITH AND SCIENCE

*Redeemer College, Ancaster, Ontario, Canada,
L9G 3N6*

The Pascal Centre was established in 1988 at Redeemer College to conduct research on the relationship between faith and science. An important aspect of the Centre's research concerns the relationship between fundamental metaphysical and religious beliefs and the historical development of natural science.

To further such studies and facilitate communication among scholars with interests in this field, the Pascal Centre is developing a History of Science research program with an emphasis on case studies dealing with the role played by metaphysical and religious belief in the work of practicing scientists.

If you would like information about applications for research grants, please send inquiries to:

Dr. Donald McNally
Assistant Director Research Communications
The Pascal Centre
Redeemer College
Ancaster, Ontario, Canada
L9G 3N6
Fax: 416/648-2134

CREATION, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE HISTORY OF "UNALIENABLE RIGHTS"

A SPECIAL BOOK REVIEW

Very rarely a well written scholarly book directed to the general reader not only corrects profound misperceptions of historical persons and events but also shows the true origin of a basic part of human social action. Such a book is *Defending the Declaration* by Gary T. Amos.¹ This excellent book belongs in the library of every Christian church, college, school, history scholar and teacher, pastor, attorney, and family especially when home schooling. It should be required collateral reading in American history courses (high school and college) dealing with the origins of America. Last but not least it makes a wonderful contribution to the history of Western law and liberty, whose ultimate foundation is man's creation in God's own image and likeness.

Defending the Declaration shows that the American Declaration of Independence is a Christian rather than deistic document as alleged by mainstream and, alas, some Christian historians. Beyond this crucial contribution to the understanding of American history the book lays bare the origin of what the Declaration calls the "unalienable rights" of men. These rights were carefully developed over several centuries by conscientious medieval Christian scholars on the basis of mankind's creation in God's own image and likeness. *Defending the Declaration* as a whole and its Chapter 4, "'Unalienable Rights' Endowed by the Creator" in particular are therefore vitally instructive not only for Americans but for freedom-loving people everywhere.

In his introduction Gary Amos briefly describes his pilgrimage from being ashamed of America in the 1960s to conversion to Christianity in 1971, which led him to re-examine American history in the light of the Bible and of church history. He found that many ideas he now knew as Christian were falsely ascribed by most historians to non-Christian sources. Amos already had a history degree and had read many books about John Locke, supposedly a deist, who had greatly influenced the Declaration of Independence. He now finally read Locke's own writings for the first time and found that Locke was in fact a Bible-believing Christian. Amos felt "tricked or robbed, ... I had been lied to. And Locke had been lied about." In 1983, after three years of intensive study of the original writings of the

American founding fathers and of the impact of Christianity on the growth and development of European law and liberty. Amos found that every key term in the Declaration of Independence had its roots in the Bible, Christian theology, the Western Christian intellectual tradition, medieval Christianity, Christian political theory, and the Christian influence on the six-hundred-year development of the English common law. (p.3)

Both secular and Christian historians have overlooked or denied the Christian roots of the Declaration of Independence. Amos cites the influential books *Search For A "Christian" America* and *A Theological Interpretation of American History*, both written by Christian historians, as examples. He explores the agreement between Christian scholars from the left, right and center that the Declaration is anti-Christian and deistic. Their view of the Declaration "dominates almost every Christian seminary and college in America. It has fueled a growing sense of shame and guilt about America ... among Christian young people ... In other words, the attacks on the Declaration are not only misguided, they are destructive" (pp.5-6).

Amos says that the typical uninstructed person's view of Christianity and the American Revolution goes something like this:

(1) True Christianity was always a "faith" not requiring the use of reason. Reason was important to the Greeks and Stoics. To give reason a role in Christianity is to mix Christianity with paganism.

(2) In the 1200s Thomas Aquinas introduced rationalism into Christianity by merging Aristotle's thought with the Bible, a perversion of the faith.

(3) Rationalism set the stage for faith to be rejected completely if science ever made faith unnecessary.

(4) John Calvin in the 1500s tried to restore Christianity to "pure faith." He made God totally inscrutable and His will unknowable.

(5) Puritans in the 1600s did not stay true to pure Calvinism but introduced rationalistic links between cosmology, a natural rights theory of government, and faith.

(6) Full-fledged rationalism entered with Isaac Newton and his mechanistic model of the universe.

(7) John Locke placed reason above the Bible. At the turn of the eighteenth century, Newton's science and Locke's extreme rationalism led directly to the Enlightenment, which replaced God with reason.

(8) This development led to Enlightenment thought in America as well so that by the time of the Declaration of Independence the colonies were submerged by rationalism and deism (pp. 11-16).

This, in general outline, is the myth taught with many variations in American colleges and universities, both secular and Christian. However, Amos points out, those who believe and teach this myth have usually failed to see what the Bible itself teaches about the relationship of faith and reason. They often do not recognize when an idea is Christian and thus call many Christian and Biblical ideas deistic or rationalistic. Hence they do not recognize thinkers like Cotton Mather or Jonathan Edwards as Christian and falsely attribute their

rational inferences from Biblical principles to "enlightenment" or "rationalist" thought. Then supposedly anti-Christian thought is credited for the emergence of political freedoms when the credit really belongs to the Biblical Christian church and world view.

Amos devotes a lengthy chapter to the Declaration's key idea of "the laws of nature and of nature's God." He believes that this phrase "may be the most misunderstood words in American legal history" (p. 35). Many people today understand them as deistic rather than Biblical Christian, usually for the following reasons: (1) Jefferson invented the phrase to reject the colonies' Christian heritage; (2) the phrase is a product of deism and Enlightenment rationalism; (3) the idea came from John Locke, supposedly a deist; (4) the phrase was a reaction against Calvinism and Puritanism; (5) even though Christians used the phrase long before Jefferson, they took it from the Greeks and Stoics. The highlights of Amos's well researched rebuttal are:

(1) In *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, John Murray shows how "the law of nature" is a Christian concept based on the teachings of the Apostle Paul.

(2) The longer phrase "law of nature or God" was used already in the very early 1300s in a debate between rival Catholic monastic orders (Dominicans and Franciscans).

(3) The simple phrase "law of nature" was already part of Catholic theology and canon law at least as early as the eleventh century.

(4) Thomas Aquinas used this phrase repeatedly in his *Summa Theologica* in the thirteenth century, and he did not make it independent from the control of Scripture.

(5) The term entered the common law of England already at the time of Bracton (d. 1268). The term meant the eternal moral law God the Creator established over His created universe. It was a technical term for "creation law"—the original scheme of things purposed or willed by the Almighty.

(6) Sir William Blackstone, the great jurist who gave us the *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765), was widely read in the colonies and required reading at almost all colonial universities. Amos quotes Blackstone at length to show that for him the "law of nature" was Christian, not deistic and indeed meant the same as "the will of God."

(7) In Romans 1 and 2 St. Paul pointed to God the Creator's general revelation in nature and in men's hearts. To restrict His law to the Mosaic law is to repudiate the law of God. St. Paul did not take his ideas in Romans 1 and 2 from the Greeks and Stoics of his time but rather from the Old Testament, written centuries earlier.

(8) Amos's extensive excerpts from John Locke's own writings show conclusively that Locke was not a deist but a Bible-believing Christian.

(9) John Calvin (*Institutes*), the Westminster Confession, Samuel Rutherford (*Lex Rex*), and supposedly deistic Matthew Tindal (*Christianity as Old as the Creation*) are quoted to show that the Declaration in no way opposed Calvinism or Puritanism.

(10) The Declaration of Independence cannot be traced to

Greek or Stoic philosophy because the Greeks and Stoics thought law and nature opposed each other, had no concept of Biblical creation *ex nihilo*, and believed that nature and God were the same. Even when the phrase "law of nature" was used, it did not mean the same as in Biblical creation-based Judaism and Christianity.

The Declaration's words "self-evident truths" have also been widely held to mean that the Declaration was deistic rather than Christian. Yet this concept appears already in English common law, St. John of Damascus (d. 749), the Bible (Romans 1 and 2), the comments of the well-known contemporary Christian Biblical scholar J. I. Packer on man's creation in the image of God according to Genesis 1:27-31, in the epistemology of the Apostle Paul, and finally in the epistemology of Richard Hooker and John Locke.

All the foregoing already makes *Defending the Declaration* well worth reading, but Chapter Four, "'Unalienable Rights' Endowed by the Creator" is most important. This chapter is a summary of the history of Western rights. The actual historical truth, which should bless, strengthen and liberate Christian believers everywhere, is that we owe our rights and freedoms in the West today not to the "Enlightenment," nor to Renaissance or modern humanistic rationalism, but rather to Biblical Christianity founded upon Biblical creation. This truth, if more widely known among Christians, might revolutionize our world. It should be shared, for instance, with our brothers and sisters in the Soviet Union who are now emerging, in the great Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's words, "from under the rubble" of socialist-communist totalitarianism, and who are unacquainted with the development of Western rights and freedoms since the separation between the Orthodox and the Catholic (Western) Church in 1054.

Here are Amos's principal conclusions in his own words:

Twentieth-century society has lost any foundation for a defensible understanding of "rights." Few today believe that rights are God-given. Most see "rights" as a matter of politics—the government creates rights, and the government can take them away. While there is a great deal of talk about "human rights" and "civil rights," hardly anyone speaks of "unalienable rights." Even in America the concept is all but lost. . . .

Church leaders in America and the West too often disparage or attack any notion of rights. They seem to be unaware that the Bible and the church gave birth to the Western notion of rights. . . .

America was founded on "unalienable rights"—those that a man may not unconditionally sell, trade, barter, or transfer without denying the image of God in himself. . . . For to deny these rights in a man is to deny that he is a human being. . . .

The starting point for a Biblical model of rights theory is Genesis 1 and 2. There we find that in the beginning God created the universe. As Creator or Author, God has the inherent right to decide or dispose of all that He

has created. . . . Man is entirely subordinate to God and dependent upon Him for all things. . . .

Not only did God create man in His own image, thus endowing man with certain faculties and abilities, but Genesis 1:28-29 also records that God gave man a decree, a "creation mandate." God commanded man to be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth, and take dominion over the earth and all its resources—the land, the plants, and the animals. . . . Endowed with God's image and also with God-given authority, man became a lord (small l) over God's earth.

The idea that man is created in God's image and has lordship over the earth is the key to the modern notion of subjective rights. Subjective rights are those that are inherent in the individual; they are inseparably part of the human personality. Being made in God's image makes man a being of enormous value and inherent worth. This notion was foreign to all ancient systems of thought and accounts for the lack of any strong concept of subjective rights outside ancient Israel or in non-Christian cultures. . . .

MEN'S INALIENABLE DUTIES TOWARD GOD TRANSLATE INTO INALIENABLE RIGHTS BETWEEN MEN (emphasis added). . . . As a steward, trustee, and protector under God, a man may resist other men's unlawful interference with the performance of that duty. This is the historical analysis and starting point of the church's doctrine of the right of self-defense and of rights generally.

GENESIS 1 AND 2 AND THE CREATION MODEL, THEREFORE, ARE THE BIBLICAL BASIS FOR RIGHTS GENERALLY AND FOR INALIENABLE RIGHTS PARTICULARLY (emphasis added). . . . (pp. 103-108)

Next, Amos compares the language of rights and the linguistics of Scripture and concludes that the Bible in both Old and New Testament provides for an objectively revealed moral law which lays down objectively ordered relationships and individual rights.

Amos then examines the beliefs about rights among the ancient Greeks and Romans. This section is important because the paganism of antiquity is now again flooding the West. Amos finds that (1) the Greeks had no clear concept of a Creator or creation in the Biblical sense but believed that all men and things participate in the divine essence or are extensions or emanations of an impersonal divine life force or energy. (2) Having no Biblical concept of creation, the Greeks had no place for an endowment of authority or power from a Creator. (3) Man existed at the whim of the gods and fate. Might rather than right prevailed, and "rights" were a product of society and state enjoyed only by the strong; the weak deserved to be the slaves of the strong. Plato and Aristotle shared these views. (4) The Greeks had no doctrine of equality and believed, as the Romans did later, that some men by nature were superior to others. (5) Neither the Greeks nor the Romans saw property as a right, much

less as an "unalienable right." Amos comments:

The idea of active and subjective claim rights, not merely passive but prosecutable rights, had to come from something other than a Greek or Roman source. Some change in Western thinking had to mark the shift from passive rights to claim rights, where all rights are juridically identifiable and legally redressable. . . .

That shift was initiated in the entrenched Hellenism of Greece and Rome by the coming of the gospel. Prior to the gospel, the state was the religion. The regime was coextensive with creation, and its purpose was to become the "best regime" by making men virtuous. Redemption was to be brought to men through political action and state activism. . . .

Christianity meant that the state was no longer the religion. The purpose of the state became completely transformed in Biblical religion. . . . redemption and virtue in man was to be produced by God's supernatural activity. The state became an administrator of justice under God's divine law . . . Christianity made possible the jurisdictional separation of church and state (pp. 114-115).

Amos places the ascendancy of the Biblical Christian model of rights in the period of 1075 to 1122, the time of the Gregorian Reform and the Investiture Struggle. He leans chiefly on historians Richard Tuck, Brian Tierney and to some extent Harold Berman for his account of the development of claim rights in the modern sense. The "unalienable right to life" is based on man's duty to live his life for God Who gave him life in the first place (and this is why man, under God, has no right to harm himself, to commit suicide, or to waste his life). Thomas Aquinas and the Dominicans reasoned that to own property was a gift of God given to man *before* the fall into sin, and this view was officially approved by Pope John XXII over against the Franciscans in 1329. Calvinism and English common law received the Dominican view.

Liberty became a "right" already between the 1350s and Jean Gerson (1402). "Gerson insisted that at Creation, men's *ius* (right) was not only an *auctoritas* (authority) but a *facultas* (ability). Gerson was then able to 'treat liberty as a kind of *dominium*' (liberty as a property)" (p. 118). Amos adds that

Once liberty came to be viewed as a right, it quickly passed into the category of inalienable rights for those following Dominican theology. Renaissance humanists, on the other hand, building on Greek and Roman ideas, rejected the notion that liberty is an inalienable right (p. 119).

Amos traces the Declaration's concept of the "pursuit of happiness" as an "unalienable right" given by the Creator to Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765), where Blackstone had written that God had "so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that

the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former" (p. 120). According to Blackstone, man's happiness meant his sense of blessedness in his earthly existence due to obeying the Creator's laws. The word itself comes from the Latin word *beatus*, immediately reminding us of the "beatitudes" of Christ's Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5), and it is also found in the Old and New Testaments.

Amos shows that it is a mistake to trace the rights theory of the Declaration not to the Catholic canonists but to the Renaissance humanists, for "the humanists of the Renaissance did not believe in the creation account, natural law, or rights from nature or creation. They rejected the Catholic ideas, based on the Biblical account of creation and society (but) simply accepted the classical Roman view" (p. 121). While Calvinists and Spanish Dominicans continued to link natural rights to "the laws of nature and God," the humanists "insisted that all rights were state-created, not God-given. . . . (They) were true naturalists in the secular sense. . . . Law was whatever a particular society determined it to be. They did not believe in a transcendent moral order that binds human laws" (p. 122). Amos quotes Tuck as follows: "The Renaissance concept (of property) belonged to a theory in which the natural life of man was right-less and therefore property-less, while the Thomist believed that by nature man did possess certain limited rights" (p. 123). Amos then quotes Brian Tierney on our precious and for the most part ignored medieval Christian-rights heritage:

The doctrine of individual rights was not a late medieval aberration from an earlier tradition of objective right or of natural moral law. Still less was it a seventeenth-century invention of Suarez or Hobbes or Locke. Rather, it was a characteristic product of the great age of creative jurisprudence that, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, established the foundations of the Western legal tradition (p. 124).

Amos rightly adds that "If Tierney is right . . . then much of what passes for the history of political theory and rights development being taught in colleges and universities in America needs to be tossed in the wastebasket." He also concludes that

Although the West received the bulk of its political freedoms and scientific vision from the impact of Christianity and the church, the church rarely gets credit for its role in the development of Western political freedoms or science. . . .

. . . modern society is trying to act on occidental secular concepts, as well as attribute Western achievements to them. That is why Western society is in the same early stages of dysfunction that preceded the fall of Greece and Rome. Having denied both the source and the rationale for the best in Western culture, we are quickly moving into the twilight era of Western freedom and the ultimate demise of free Christian society. . . .

Personal rights and freedoms are God-given and inalienable; they do not exist merely for civil conve-

nience or at the discretion of those who hold civil power. This is why only Biblical ethics maintain a proper balance between order in public life and individual freedom (pp. 125-126).

There are two more excellent chapters on the Biblical origin of the phrase "Government by the Consent of the Governed" and on "God as Supreme Judge and Divine Providence." The latter contains a challenging essay on the nature of language, which refutes the current misconception among historians that the church fathers, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and even the Apostle Paul adopted Greek or Stoic concepts because they used the Greek language. However, Amos says, the Bible's picture of God, the world, man and nature is entirely different from Greek philosophy and pagan religion, and St. Paul, the church fathers, Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin, Luther and the Reformers transformed the Greek words they used with Christian worldview concepts. "The miracle of the New Testament," Amos concludes, "is that God in His providence chose to use Greek, one of the most religiously and philosophically corrupt languages in history, as the vehicle by which to communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ. . . . The gospel stands for the proposition that God redeems and restores even man's fallen vocabulary" (p. 163).

When you read the Declaration of Independence in Appendix A immediately following Amos's spirited and thorough defense, you read it with new eyes and new gratitude. We received it not from secular-minded deists or rationalists but rather from Biblical, creation-based Christianity.

Be sure you read this outstanding, pioneering book, including the extensive, most instructive end notes. Highest recommendation.

— *Reviewed by Ellen Myers*

Gary T. Amos, *Defending the Declaration* (Brentwood, TN 37027: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1749 Mallory Lane, Suite 110; Hardcover, 235 pp. incl. 2 Appendices, End Notes and Bibliography). \$14.99 single copy ppd. Quantity prices available from Word, Inc., 1-800-299-9673.

CREATION, KINGDOM, HOME

Ellen Myers

God created man in His own image and likeness and gave him dominion over the works of His hands (Genesis 1:26, 28). He provided man and animals abundantly with green herbs for food (Gen. 1:29-30). He provided a mist going up from the earth to water the whole face of the ground (Gen.2:6). He planted the garden of Eden and put man in charge to dress and to keep it (Gen.2.8, 15). Man named all the animals, expressing their God-created identity, that is, their true essence (Gen.2:19-20). Then God made the first woman to be the man's helper and companion, "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh" (Gen.2:23). He thereby laid the foundation for marriage and family (Gen.2:24). In their blessedness and innocence in God's pristine, perfect creation the man and his wife were in perfect communion with their glorious Creator and with each other, "naked and not ashamed" (Gen.2:25).

This blessed state of God's original creation is man's and all creation's true home, lost by the Fall. Its restoration is the goal and purpose of man's redemption and salvation in Jesus Christ. It already begins here and now in God's regenerate people, and it extends to all that they touch, for Christ lives in them as their new life (Gal.2:20). This true home of man and all creation will be fully revealed at Christ's Coming Again, for "When Christ Who is our life appears, then you also will appear with Him in glory" (Col.3:4). As George MacDonald put it, "The Kingdom of Heaven has come near us that we may enter into it, and be all at home together. Kingdom and home are one." Home is the place and state where all is well for all who dwell there, where "Mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed" (Psalm 85:10). Yes, God's kingdom is the perfect home for God's creation and especially for man made in God's own image and likeness. The whole creation groans and travails in pain while hoping and waiting for the full restoration and Christ-like liberty of the sons of God (Romans 8:19-22).

The Fall was our first parents' rebellion against our Creator and King. They chose to "be as gods" themselves rather than submit to His command not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 3). His command was given for their good, and their insubordination only brought them harm, just as God had warned. Immediately upon their act of disobedience they felt shame at their nakedness and attempted to hide from God Whom they now feared. When He questioned the woman, she blamed the serpent; the man blamed the woman and implicitly God Himself. Thus, having broken their communion with God, they lost communion with each other and the rest of God's creation as well. They passed on their disintegration to their posterity and to the rest of the world: disintegration of their created identity or essence (no longer

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Fall 1991)

in God's perfect image and likeness), of fellowship with each other, and disintegration of their right relationship with animals, plants and the very ground they had to till for their physical sustenance. Their first son became the first murderer who shed his own brother's blood (Genesis 4). No longer was the world man's home but rather the scene of man's self-assertiveness, culminating in hatred and murder of his fellow men. And so it has remained ever after as scoffers deny God, His creation, the Flood He sent in Noah's day, the Return of Christ, and the final fiery judgment to come (II Peter 3).

As in all generations, so today only a small remnant of men exists who are hungering and thirsting for God and His righteousness and long for being truly at home with Him in His Kingdom. As they grow in closeness to Him their Creator, Lord and their Father in Christ, they long to spread their new life in Him in all its blessedness, peace and joy to the whole world, as Christ commanded them (Matthew 28: 18-20). They become good neighbors, brothers and sisters, fathers, mothers and children. Their very dwelling places on this earth become as it were little gardens of Eden, visible parts of God's Kingdom where God, man and the rest of creation are again at home with each other.

This is why true Christian people are *hospitable*, gladly opening their homes and hearts to their neighbors. This writer was drawn to Christ by a dear Christian woman who made her poor room a place of refuge and help to all who called on her. Wealth is not needed for hospitality; it may even become an obstacle to it whenever people let their possessions take precedence over communion with other people, and hence with God Himself. Today, as in all affluent societies throughout history, children with their insistent calls upon their parents' money and time are especially dreaded by those who prize wealth and "self-fulfillment" above all else. Margaret Sanger, the founder of the modern Planned Parenthood movement, scorned the poor because they kept having many children. Yet to welcome one's own children into the world is to obey God's commandment given to man immediately upon his creation (Genesis 1:28). George MacDonald and his wife, living in the still largely Christian nineteenth century, had eleven children. In addition they adopted three others as well as the mother of two of them who was dying of consumption. This despite their own lifelong poverty and despite MacDonald's almost constant ill-health! No wonder C. S. Lewis praises MacDonald for being "hospitable as only the poor can be." Today large families like MacDonald's are disdained in the wealthy, jaded, "post-Christian" West, and even forcibly prevented in Communist China where women are aborted by government order when pregnant for the second time. Abortion, which destroys a human being in its own mother's womb, its first God-created home, is now legal almost everywhere on earth, and an open, massive affront to God the Creator and King. Euthanasia, the intentional killing of the handicapped, infirm and old who are no longer wanted in our health- and youth-obsessed society, is already becoming acceptable and even court-sanctioned as well. No one can feel at home—loved and welcome—in this generation.

The "nuclear family," now the norm in Western society, is largely based upon rampant individualism and self-assertion. Marriage has become a "contract between consenting adults" rather than the "one flesh," the life-long integral union and communion between man and wife which God Himself ordained in the beginning (Gen.2:21-24, Matthew 19.3-9). Communion with God in all human relationships is overlooked, neglected or deliberately rejected. Men, women and their few children go their separate ways. Tens of thousands of children run away from their parents, and parents "throw away" their children because they can no longer tolerate their rebelliousness or else because they themselves rebel against parenthood. All too often a "home" is merely a place to watch television, to sleep, to store or display one's possessions, and to receive one's mail and messages. Meals no longer reunite families; dining out and convenience foods allow each individual to come and go independently. "Latchkey children" return from school to empty dwellings. Pre-school tots are warehoused in day care centers. Even where marriage partners are still together and outwardly provide for their children, true communion, true hospitality, and care for one another are all too often absent. Family members are not open to each other and unwilling to help bear each others' burdens. They want to gratify only themselves and see spouses and especially children as obstructions to their own "self-fulfillment." Hence divorce and child abuse as well as juvenile suicide are skyrocketing.

Because people no longer take the trouble to really know and listen to each other, professional counselors increasingly replace family communication and communion. Along with the disintegration of the family goes loneliness and a feeling of being useless and meaningless. This is because the real world, created by the God of the Bible who is Himself a communion of Three Persons in One, is intensely personal. No impersonal, commercially based, paid counseling can possibly take the place of personal communion among people which alone can help them to be truly "at home" with each other. When Jesus Christ summed up all the law and the prophets in the two Great Commandments to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, minds, souls and strength, and to love our neighbors as ourselves, He only paraphrased His answer to the Tempter that man does not live by bread alone but by every word of God (Matthew 4:4). We die when we reject any word of God even as Adam and Eve died spiritually and began to die physically when they sought "self-fulfillment" by eating of the forbidden fruit. All temptation, beginning with the Serpent's in Eden, consists in denying true reality and suggesting that we can "be as gods" by making up a reality of our own. The result of giving in to temptation is always the wounding and destruction of our selves we want to gratify, and the loss of our true home in the true world God created.

The key to living in God's created reality, the only true reality there is, is therefore to cease listening to our self-will, and to submit to God and His will instead. Such willed obedience is impossible to us as we are, "dead in trespasses and sins" (Ephesians 2:1). This is why

we must be "born again from above" (John 3:3, 5-7). We must receive Him and let Him live His life in us moment by moment as He gives us power to become the sons of God (John 1:12-13). We will not have peace on earth, good will among men, home and communion in world, nation and family without Him and His life from above in us. As long as we persist in wanting "to be as gods," living by our own notions of good and evil (even though we might achieve a measure of "law and order"), this world will continue to be not our home but our battle and burial ground. We must understand God's Kingdom as the perfect home where it is more blessed to give than to receive, where we serve each other, where we make each other welcome and comfortable, where we bear each other's burdens, where we listen, really *listen* to our brothers, sisters and neighbors with Christ's compassion. Our compassion, like His compassion, must extend to the poor, the old, the lame and the handicapped, beginning with the babes in the womb and extending to the dying. It must be *personal*, not the mere administration of tax-financed "social services" which can never make their recipients feel at home. Like God the Father and like Jesus Christ we must be hospitable, not casting out any who come to us (John 6:37). We must *take time for others*, or rather, realize that "our" time belongs to God Who sends us our fellow human beings so we might be as Christ to them. To live in Christ and know Christ living in us is just this, to spend all the time He gives us moment by moment loving Him and loving our neighbor as ourselves.

The lesser creatures around us, our animals and plants, our very houses and goods, should also belong to our Kingdom, our home in Christ Jesus and God our Father. God Himself cared for them from the beginning by providing their food and shelter (Psalm 104:10-28). We who are His stewards, kings and priests should take joy in their well-being, their rejoicing in being in our care. As we provide for them under our Provident God and Savior, our "El Shaddai" (the "nurturing God," Genesis 17:1), we provide for our own pleasure as well. It means a life of moment-by-moment service and care for others. Only by living thus we are blessed and "taste and see that our Lord is good" (Psalm 34:8). Only thus we know that at our God's right hand there are pleasures forevermore (Psalm 16:11).

A wife and homemaker who rebels against God's created reality seeks first of all her own self-fulfillment and gratification. She cares and provides for others only to the extent that she feels compelled to do so by prevailing "community standards" and to enhance her self-image. A godly homemaker, on the other hand, rejoices when her home and family are well cared for by her diligent labor (Proverbs 31:10-31). They, not she, come first; loving service to God and neighbors, not "self-fulfillment," is her purpose in life. And by God's altogether perfect providence, making a home for others gives her home and complete self-fulfillment as well. Now all men and women regenerate in Christ are to be such good "homemakers" in the good will of our Creator and Lord. "Homemaking" and "dominion" under God (Genesis 1:28) are one and the same. The home we are called to make and inhabit is none other than the reality of His Kingdom.

THE SCHOOL - A RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FAMILY

Jean-Marc Berthoud

In the *Basic Charter on Schooling*, founding document of the *Association of Christian Parents of Vaud* (Switzerland), we read:

The responsibility for the education of the children is incumbent first of all upon the parents, and only by delegation upon school institutions. The rights and the obligations of the parents with regard to their children have priority above those of the state." (Article 4)

This first responsibility of the family in education and the schooling of its children is a truth of the order of creation and hence valid for all men, believers or not, of any place and any time. The family is the founding institution of society. It is from it and from the Covenant which God established with it at creation, and not from the apostate state of modern times and from the myth of an imaginary original social contract on which it is based, that all social institutions are derived. Actually the myth of the social contract was developed in a nominalist and thoroughly anti-Christian tradition. It is part of the current of ideas which goes from Marsilius of Padua to Hobbes, from John Locke to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This myth seeks to replace the family as founding institution of every healthy society, honoring the Creator and therefore truly useful to men, by the state autonomous from God and His laws. ...

The priority which God gave to the family in the social order is forgotten by our modern world. Since the development of absolute monarchy in the seventeenth century the creation covenant of God with men, fixing by God's law the conditions of all true life in society, has been replaced by a mythical social contract of men amongst themselves in order to found the modern autonomous state. This is as true for those regimes calling themselves *democratic* as for those openly totalitarian.

We must return to the realist vision of society as divine covenant founded upon the conditions God laid down at creation. These conditions are defined once and for all by biblical Law and summed up in the Ten Commandments. Only by rejecting the tradition of the social contract and by returning to God the Creator of the cosmic, political and social order and to His laws will we demolish the fraudulent legitimacy of the modern state. ...

We must realize that only a course of action attacking this evil at the root can justify the priority we give to the duties of parents toward their children over those which the state claims to want to exercise. ... It is not possible to fight against the claim of the modern state to exercise an absolute right of life and death over all its citizens ... without equally denouncing its claim to be its own founder,

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Fall 1991)

its own norm, its own God. ...

Evidently the family as independent institution is always the first enemy to be attacked. For the labor to destroy it is in vain, it always rises from its ashes. For it is not possible to establish any society whatsoever which can last without its cooperation. Yet we must realize clearly that as we work to re-establish the family's duties and creational functions in society, we declare war against the divine pretensions of the Leviathan State. The anti-creational process of elimination of independent institutions ... is bound to proceed above all by way of the abolition of any real social, economic and political autonomy of the family. This is why modern legislation on the family in most of our Western countries has replaced the Christian view of marriage as a covenant or as a sacrament, a view conferring upon it an inalterable status and character, by a simple contract of commercial type which can be dissolved at will. ...

We must reawaken Christian parents to the dangers threatening the family and arm them in order to fight effectively in this war without mercy they are facing. ... It would be the task of the churches, and in particular of the clergy, to instruct the people of God in these realities. ... unfortunately, and only with rare exceptions, they are incapable of accomplishing this task. ... We founded the *Association of Christian Parents of Vaud* in 1979 in order to try to fill this void. It seeks to promote public action in favor of the family and the school in the perspective defined by the Law of God. Its statutes define its goal as being that of "promoting education of youth according to the norms established by the Law of God." (Article 4) The bases of its action are:

- ◆ historic Christianity revealed by an infallible Bible, holding its authority from God and normative for all aspects of human life (rejection of all spiritual subjectivism);
- ◆ the absolute and conceptually definable Truth of the Christian faith (rejection of all philosophical subjectivism);
- ◆ respect for the commandments of God (rejection of all moral subjectivism);
- ◆ the application of these commandments to the social reality of our time (rejection of religious individualism, and of the separation of moral obligations from public duties).

Our action as a non-confessional association allows the cooperation of Christians from diverse backgrounds and is limited to the goals defined above, without entering into doctrinal and spiritual discussions of a properly denominational kind. Such doctrinal debates, though certainly essential, must be reserved for another context. Our first task as an association of Christian parents has been to recall to Christian circles the forgotten biblical teachings about the Christian perspective of society, and especially about the responsibilities of the family in the area of teaching. ...

One of the tasks, and by no means the least, which is incumbent upon the Christian family renewed and strengthened in Christ and by the Holy Spirit according to the creation model, is to assume the responsibility for the education and the instruction of the children, either by its own means—for example by starting what is called the

school at home, the home schooling so widespread in the United States—or by delegating its authority to pedagogical institutions of its choice whose action would be only the reinforcement of the values defended by the family. ...

Within the framework of our association of parents we have paid particular attention to the doctrinal bases necessary for pedagogical action in the interest of the family. In the past the Church of God formulated *Symbols* and *Confessions of Faith* which defined the essential foundations of the Faith on particular contested or deformed points. These were doctrinal defense posts indispensable for the survival of the Faith revealed once and for all by God to men, the Faith Christians had the duty to guard and keep in the same terms in which it had been transmitted to them by the Apostles (I Corinthians 15:2).

In the pedagogical domain there are also numerous errors/heresies: child-centeredness, moral relativism, epistemological agnosticism, biological evolutionism (Darwin) or psychological-epistemological evolutionism (Piaget), historicism, laxism, non-direct edness, statism, and so on, which must be carefully defined so we can defend ourselves against them. ... For as we affirm in our *Charter of Instruction*, we must not only be guided by sane pedagogical principles which are in conformity with the true nature of the children and the objective relationship between teachers and students, but we must also, in Christian instruction worthy of this name, bring all thoughts of the children in subjection to the obedience of Jesus Christ (Romans 12:2). We formulate this principle thus:

It is indispensable to establish in all subjects of instruction an overall conception of scholarly programs answering to a true Christian finality respecting the real, and to act so that the Christian view of instruction here defined might again inspire the public education of our (area). (Article 8)

For our concern is not only to form the Christian thought of Christian parents on these matters and to enable them to assume the responsibilities God gave them in entrusting children to them, but to act upon society at large. For Christ declared to His disciples that as children of God they were "the light of the world" and "the salt of the earth," that "the world would not overcome their faith," for this evil world had already been defeated by the decisive victory of Jesus Christ at the cross, and that they must, while drawing upon the omnipotence of the Son of God on earth and in heaven, work to "disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit and teach them to keep all His commandments" (Matthew 28:18-20).

If a recovery of our civilization is to happen, it is of the greatest urgency to found numerous similar associations of Christian parents duly adapted to their local and national circumstances. Their task will be:

- ◆ to inform parents uneasy about the situation in which their children find themselves;
- ◆ to furnish to the parents and the children the weapons

indispensable to the struggle against the destruction of family, school and social cohesion;

- ◆ to furnish to the parents the necessary means so they can react in time to the debilitating influence of the public schools upon their children;
- ◆ to help them to arrest the movement of decay all too evident in many church schools caught in the net of influence of the state schools;
- ◆ to encourage them to undertake the instruction of their children themselves at home and to furnish them the teaching materials indispensable for this form of instruction;
- ◆ finally, such efforts must lead to the founding of numerous Christian schools which would become the veritable seed-beds of a return to a civilization worthy of this name.

By all these actions and yet many others we must work to reverse the current trend that is so destructive to all Christian and human values. ...

Such a work of Christian recovery cannot succeed without reawakening faith in Jesus Christ, without a resolute love of Truth, without a return to the joyous obedience to the commandments of God which is the spirit of sacrifice, and without a fervent spirit of prayer. **May our God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit come to our aid.**

Editor's Note: *Translated, abridged and reprinted with permission from an address delivered at the Congress of the 20th Anniversary of the French Right to Life organizations Laisser les Vivre and SOS Futures Meres, Paris, March 3-4, 1991.*

OBSERVATIONS AND PERSPECTIVES ON HOME EDUCATION

Samuel Peavey

The remarkable revival of home education in recent years may someday be seen as one of the most significant educational developments of this century. Home education is an integral part of the current movement toward freedom of choice among educational alternatives. However, there is reason to regard the home school as having an identity and integrity of its own. It is well worthy of study and understanding as the most private form of private school.

The renaissance of family-centered schooling is the natural outcome of a number of forces converging in a fateful era. Not the least of all those forces is the well documented fact that both the American home and the American school have reached the lowest level of mediocrity in our history. Both have betrayed the birthright of our children. The home school is a normal response of concerned parents to that mounting crisis. The home school is a pointed effort to salvage values that once undergirded schools as well as homes. Home education is a rejection of the trend toward almost total institutionalization of child rearing. It is a reaction to a decline in scholarship and character in the classroom. It is a testimony of faith in the family — a faith that is almost lost.

My experience as Private Education Liaison of the faculty of the School of Education of the University of Louisville has given me an informed sensitivity to the concerns of families seeking religious and educational freedom in the private sector. Further, as my state's representative for the Council for American Private Education, I have come to know home schoolers throughout a number of states. I have visited in their homes, addressed their gatherings, examined their instructional materials, interviewed parents and children, observed teaching, reviewed instructional plans, verified achievement and testified in their behalf before legislatures and courts. I have counseled home schooling parents facing threats of lawsuits, arrest, fines, charges of child neglect, imprisonment and harassment from civil and educational authorities. My firm conclusion is that it is time for citizens in general and educators in particular to recognize and respect home-based, family-centered education for what it is and for what it is achieving.

Too often the most uncompromising critics of home education are persons who know little about it. The increasing institutionalization of children's upbringing is espoused as liberation from traditional family roles. It seems difficult for many to believe that modern

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Fall 1991)

parents have the competence necessary to rear their own children. They find it hard to conceive of family-centered schooling in their communities where broken homes, working mothers, unwed parents, absentee fathers and latch-key children have become the norm. The point should be made clear. A home school is first of all a home. The first requirement for a successful home school is a successful home.

I am not a promoter of home schooling per se. I am a promoter of free choice among educational alternatives. It is my professional judgment that home-based education is one of the most significant and successful alternatives available to parents today. I have testified under oath to that fact on numerous occasions in recent years. In the course of my testimony, the same predictable questions repeatedly arise. Allow me to focus briefly on the major concerns many people have about home schools.

How well do children learn in a home school?

There is ample evidence that home school students as a whole achieve at a higher level than students in regular school on standardized measures of basic knowledge and skills. Reliable studies in a number of states provide that evidence. A standard test of the basic skills of home schoolers in one study where over half of the students were taught by parents with only a high school education showed impressive achievement. Ninety-one percent of the students were achieving at or above grade level in reading. Any school would have reason to be proud of such a showing.

A 1987 testing of 873 home school students in Washington on the Stanford Achievement Test showed them clearly at or above average in 104 of the 120 test categories. In Alaska, a statewide appraisal of basic skills found home school students at all grade levels averaging in the top fourth of the nation.

In Oregon, a study of 1,100 home schoolers found 76% scoring at or above average in achievement. The Hewitt Research Foundation in Washington made a study of several thousand home school students throughout the U.S. They were on the average in the 75th to the 95th percentile on the Stanford and Iowa achievement tests.

I am not aware of any reliable and comprehensive study that shows home school students doing less well than their peers in regular schools. We in professional education might well be intrigued by how this superior level of learning is attained in such modest circumstances by teachers with only a limited formal education.

Are ordinary parents qualified to teach?

That question is a legitimate one for a person who has been equating teacher qualifications with a college diploma and a state teaching certificate. I hold two advanced degrees from two distinguished universities in teacher education, i.e., in teaching teachers how to teach. It has been my privilege to help prepare thousands of

university students to meet the qualifications for a teaching certificate or permit to teach. They were as a whole fine young people, and many have done well in the classroom. It has been most interesting to me to see home school parents with high school diplomas doing as well or better than my certified teachers as measured by their students' standardized test results. Those parents revealed some things to me about living, loving and learning that I was never taught by my distinguished professors at Harvard and Columbia.

I have observed that most home study materials and activities are designed to allow the student to proceed on his own a large part of the time as an independent learner. That is teaching at its best. The situation is so different from the classroom where the teacher must face a room full of children and spend a major part of her time and energy maintaining order while wondering what is taking place in individual minds.

The parent in a home school situation actually plays a more professional role as a monitor, tutor, counselor and resource person. One mother said her best advice on teaching came from her ten-year old son who urged her to stop acting like a teacher!

It is gratifying that state authorities have recognized the injustice and futility of trying to force state teaching certificates on parents who choose to educate their own children in their own homes, and for whom the state certificate was never designed. It is significant to note that the parent-teachers in home education are clearly demonstrating for us what a half century of educational research has revealed: a total lack of any significant relationship between the teacher's certificate and the pupil's achievement. Those research findings have been known and ignored for many years. Some examples of those studies follow.

Freeman observed that teacher certification requirements appear to have been conceived through intuition and then converted into certification regulations. Freeman found no significant relation between teacher certification and performance in the classroom. (*Legal Issues in Teacher Preparation and Certification, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1977.*)

Eisdorfer and Tractenberg identified several situations in which legal challenges to teacher certification may occur. They expect state courts to become actively involved in teacher certification as more challenges to their legal validity continue to arise. (*Legal Issues in Teacher Preparation and Certification, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1977.*)

Hawk, Coble and Swanson of East Carolina University in their study of all available research evidence concluded that there is little, if any, documentation to support the assertion that the effectiveness of teachers is a function of increased certification requirements. (*Journal of Teacher Education, May-June 1985.*)

In spite of all that evidence to the contrary, state school authorities continue to maintain that the certified teacher is the qualified teacher. It is particularly painful to see state authorities harassing and criminalizing educators who shun that invalid credential. The

only valid measure of effective teaching that we have found is the degree in which pupils are learning. On that score, the teachers in home schools as a whole are demonstrating their effectiveness.

Does the socialization of children suffer in home schools?

The formation of one's social character and social values occurs in an interaction of positive socialization and negative socialization. The same is true of a home, a school or a total society. Few persons would deny that the forces of negative socialization that dominate our society today have undermined the social values and social character of children's homes, children's schools and children's lives. Tots and teens wander in a value vacuum. The forces of positive socialization have lost much of their effectiveness in the schools that the state compels its children to attend. The community school of today is not the sheltered, unspoiled place one associates with an earlier era in which the forces of positive socialization were predominant. Every problem, pressure and perplexity of our modern day interacts in the socialization of children in the classroom.

There is increasing recognition that the organization of the school is also a negative factor in children's socialization. Hurrying children from bell to bell and from cell to cell with arbitrary groupings of their peers was never designed for the normal socialization of children. Rather, it evolved as an expedient structure for compulsory mass institutionalization of children. Most children learn to tolerate and conform to the process their elders have developed as the best way of processing children en masse. However, students of child behavior are coming to realize that under the false facade of compliance with institutional demands, children experience a host of pressures, tensions and stresses that few of them could identify or verbalize. The nature of life and learning in such an environment generates abnormal values, roles, relationships and behaviors. As a result, children are turned inward upon themselves and their peers in an interaction rife with peer pressure, peer dominance, peer images and peer values.

Out of that situation emerge the diverse problems of children which teachers face in today's classroom — social isolation, identity crises, poor self-image, emotional stress, competition, frustration, delinquency, hostility, moral confusion, boredom, rejection, burn-out, sexual promiscuity, violence, vandalism, teen pregnancy, alcohol, drugs and certainly the most tragic of all, suicide.

On that background, it should not be necessary to explain further the deep concern home school parents feel for the social character and social behavior of their children. That concern alone might well stimulate the growth of home schooling beyond anything we have yet imagined. More importantly, it could draw home schoolers closer together as functional family units where both parents and the children might well rediscover themselves and each other in their joint venture in living and learning.

A related study by John Taylor of Andrews University compared

224 home schoolers in grades 4-12 with regular school students using the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. It is generally conceded that a favorable self-concept is indicative of an individual's socialization. Taylor's study concluded, "The self-concept of home-schooling children is significantly higher than that of children attending the conventional school. Regarding socialization, it appears that very few home-schooling children are socially deprived . . . The research data indicate that it is the conventionally schooled child who is actually deprived."

Urie Bronfenbrenner, among others, found that children at least through the sixth grade who spend more of their elective time with their peers than with their parents generally become dependent on those peers. He noted that this brought a pervasive pessimism about themselves, their future, their parents and even their peers. This does not support the idea that a child's association with many children necessarily contributes to positive socialization as many parents and educators assume.

First hand observations of home schooled children commonly impress observers with their qualities of maturity, stability, responsiveness and self-assurance. In fact, parents often report that their decision to home school their children came from observing the impressive social qualities of other home school students. Certainly one should not underestimate the contribution to social values and social character that comes from a firm foundation in moral and spiritual values common to most home schools.

Are home school students prepared for college?

Home schoolers have little difficulty in entering and succeeding in college if they plan wisely and make the most of their opportunities. High school and college counselors are available to advise on planning for entrance into specific colleges and vocations. Instruction in advanced and specialized college preparatory courses is available through extension courses from schools and colleges, educational TV, part-time enrollment in the local high school and tutors. Lack of some college preparatory courses can often be made up in college while enrolled in a conditional admission status. In most colleges, admission is dependent primarily on standard admissions tests. GED certificates often suffice in lieu of a high school diploma. College admissions offices understand that diplomas and grades per se from the regular high school offer little assurance of college preparation or potential since the standards from different schools vary greatly.

Most home school programs are uniquely designed and are conducted with a stress on independent study, individual responsibility, self-evaluation and the use of diverse resources, all of which prepare one for success in college study. Studies of genius indicate that the Independent, self-directive, open, undistracted environment of most home schools provides the best setting for the development of gifted and creative minds.

What is home schooling really like?

As often stated, home schooling is the most private form of private education. It is not designed for isolation but for privacy — privacy for living and learning in an intimate family environment. The family, of course, maintains all normal relations with the social, civic, cultural, recreational, religious and business activities and resources of the community. Home school students enjoy the usual friendships and activities for children and youth that any good parent would want for them. Many public and private schools offer extension study status and part-time enrollment for home schoolers, thus providing access to elective courses, school facilities, counseling and participation in certain activities.

An impressive variety of professionally designed curricula for kindergarten through high school is being used successfully by parent-tutors with only limited formal education. The curriculum publisher/distributor ordinarily provides the home school parent a continuing consultative service on procedures, problems, testing and additional resources. Colleges, universities and correspondence schools provide a wide range of courses for independent study. Rich resources continue to become more available and attractive. Complete courses plus enrichment experiences are increasingly offered on educational TV.

The concept of home education raises the question in some minds as to whether home-based schooling prepares students for "real life." However, most observers would conclude that the best preparation for real life is to live it every day, as homeschoolers do. It is the institutionalized student in the regular school who is compelled to live in an unreal setting. The home school commonly provides a much broader daily relationship with the community than does the classroom of the traditional school. Experience indicates that three or four hours at most of formal instruction and study in basic subjects each school day in the home are sufficient to maintain a student at grade level. The remainder of the day is devoted to individual projects, field trips, art, music, libraries, museums, educational television, volunteer work in community agencies, sharing family responsibilities, hobbies and the establishment of "cottage industries" as money-making enterprises in such things as gardening, art crafts, bake sales, woodworking, pet raising and lawn care.

Any image of the home school as a worn and weary mother huddled with her brood in the kitchen is far from the full scenario of home education today. National, state and community support groups provide forums for fellowship and exchange of ideas and experiences on the enlarging frontier of home education. Such support groups collaborate in planning field experiences and group activities for students and for sharing common concerns. Periodic workshops bring parents together to examine and acquire materials for teaching and learning, and to hear consultants on pertinent matters. A helping hand is extended to beginners in home schooling.

A number of legal associations have been developed to pro-

vide support and counsel for home educators facing difficulties with state and school authorities. There is an impressive and expanding literature on family-centered schooling. A number of periodicals and newsletters in the field keep home schoolers abreast of current developments. It is reported that some 200 studies and university theses dealing with home education are now underway.

Why is home education necessary?

In a democracy with a tradition of free enterprise, educational choice is a vital response to the state's sheltered monopoly over the molding of children's minds and characters. Although motives for turning to home education vary, the common motive, of course, is the conviction that the home and family setting can provide for children an education superior to that offered through other available and affordable alternatives. The majority are reacting to the fact that the government school no longer allows open recognition and reverence for God or for the divine nature and destiny of man. Others are concerned with the academic deterioration of public education and find that their children attain much better achievement in home schooling. Many are concerned over the modern degeneracy of home and family life and seek to maintain a close and caring environment for their own children. Some hold distinct philosophical and world views in which they want their children nurtured. Other subscribe to educational outlooks on child development that they feel can be best fostered in the home.

Conclusion

Home education is not a passing fancy. Those of us in professional education have long known that the strongest influence on a child's school achievement is parental involvement. That factor is indeed paramount in the home school. As our schools have become more massive, technological, impersonal, antisocial, amoral and institutionalized, perhaps educators need a more simple, natural and humane laboratory in which to explore the basic elements of living and learning. I would suggest that those basic elements are all there and thriving in a unique manner in the privacy and normalcy and simplicity of the home school.

Let us close with the observation that home schooling is not for all. Neither is compulsory state institutionalization.

This report is excerpted from the TPA Newsletter, April 1991. It was first presented to the New Hampshire House Education Committee 3/15/90

BOOK REVIEW

Judith Miles, *Journal from an Obscure Place*.
Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc., 1978. Pb.,
140 pp., out of print.

One of the earliest pieces of literature exposing the horror of abortion was a leaflet "Diary of an Unborn Baby," widely distributed by pro-life people in the 1970s. Judith Miles' beautiful little book is also written as though by a preborn baby. It also describes prenatal development in detail. Yet there are great differences. First, *Journal from an Obscure Place* ends with the baby's birth, while "Diary of an Unborn Baby" ended "Today my mother killed me." Second, *Journal from an Obscure Place* deals so gently and compassionately with all the people involved in choosing life or death (abortion) for the baby, yet shows so clearly the biblical meaning of either choice, that it can speak to anyone without sounding pharisaical. Third, *Journal from an Obscure Place* is a unique presentation of human prenatal development as the picture of God's plan for man, created in His own image and likeness. Meticulous research undergirds this wonderful, inspiring concept.

In the second week of its life, the preborn child says, "The brain part of me is growing faster than the other parts now. The head must come first, and the body follows. ... I am a microscopic picture of a pattern: the Head leads the Body." (p.13)

In the third week of gestation, a truly marvelous development takes place:

I have a heart that beats! ... Love created my heart to function first because without the heart no other part of me can function. The rest of me can grow when my heart provides movement or motive power for my vital blood to circulate. ...

Look how Love is writing on my unscarred physical heart! My heart will be in two parts, like two stone tablets, side by side. ... The right side of my heart will be like a tablet that faces Love, open and waiting to receive life. The left side will be like a tablet open for other people to read me. ...

The third opening Love is making in the right part of my heart is the tricuspid valve ... The valve opening is growing into three parts which form one ring at their base. It is like a name that has three parts, yet is one. ...

The tenth major opening is for the aorta, the artery that will carry renewed blood out to nourish my many parts. This is the mainspring of my heart's ministry to the rest of the body. ... this opening must never become constricted with junk or I might die. My heart can never

supply nourishment and allow life to flow if it grasps and desires for itself. ...

You are writing your order on my heart. You are putting the picture of your law into the very physical design and fiber of my heart. ... Your finger is writing your love forever onto my heart, and I am only three weeks old.

In the next brief chapter, about the fourth week of prenatal development, the preborn baby tells us of the appearing of the protovertebrae or mesoblastic somites. There are forty-two or forty-four pairs of them, and

Each pair side by side looks like an open book, ... the forty-two (or four) little block pairs correspond exactly to the words of teaching in books that Love has written somewhere long ago. My body holds during this fourth week a tiny picture of the pattern of these old Love-breathed books. ...

A striking description follows of the exact correspondence between the vertebrae and the books of the Bible—too exact, even an unbeliever might think, for mere coincidence. Christian believers will say together with the preborn baby of the story: "O, Love, how I praise You that You are putting me together to reflect Your Holy Book! You saw your finished Book before it was begun; You saw me before I was begun too. Each one of Your books came in its own proper time and sequence; each part of me is developing according to Your design too." (p.22)

A wonderful passage on Christ's conception and the beginning of human life at conception ought to settle this matter for Christians once and for all:

That transcendent concept of the Incarnation reduces to gibberish any feeble attempt to declare that the human spirit, or the breath of the Creator, enters the human tissues at any given point of development after conception or at birth. If Love is able to materialize the pre-existent Messiah in a moment of time by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, He is also able to create human life in the instant of conception.(p.39)

The author also compares the beginning of human life in the womb to the movement of the Spirit at creation, and to God's "personally model(ing) the form of the first man in His own image from the clay."

A marvelous chapter follows on the Trinity of God pictured in the preborn baby's threefold development: "My little body formed first the ectoderm, then the endoderm, and finally, proceeding and migrating from the ectoderm, the mesoderm." The author points to the correspondence of ectoderm to God the Father, of endoderm to the Holy Spirit, while

"My mesoderm germ layer that is becoming my bone and flesh and blood is picturing the Perfect Son who became flesh. ... His flesh and blood are to be food to me. My life is sustained by the blood. And the Son is the One who knits me together by joints and ligaments

with the increase of Love. The bones picture His perfect fulfillment of the Word of God. Of course, none of my parts work independently of the others. All are part of one indivisible whole. Yet each kind is distinct in its functioning.

Can you see it? Can you see it as I do? When my Creator made me He put pictures of His three personalities into my design. I am trinitarian to the very core of my being. I am made from the first in the image of Love."(p.43)

A few chapters on external happenings separate this wonderful passage from another inspiring section on how the integration of bodily functions, already in the preborn child, point to the interrelationship of Christians in the Church, Christ's Body:

One of the most amazing things about my body is the exactness of God's design that puts every part into an intricate and precise relationship with every other part at the perfect time. Nothing is superfluous; nothing can exist apart from the whole. ... We can readily see the vital interworkings of nearly every part of the human body, each receiving its "orders" from the head.

The human body is like a picture of the relationships of Christians to one another and to Christ here on earth. Jesus is the Head and various Christians are the members. No member can live long without being integrated into the living body."(p.86)

The mother of the preborn baby in the story is unwed. She suffers from her own worldly mother's shame at having a daughter pregnant out of wedlock, and also from rejection even by Christian friends. "And then that still, small voice that was not audible reminded her, 'Don't forget. My own Mother knew the pain of being an unwed mother for a time, even though she was a virgin. Your suffering can be a holy participation in my plan of salvation for your little one.'"(p.97)

The book ends with the impending birth of the baby, who praises God because "All of my needs have been provided with no effort from me. I hope that I will not become so enamored of striving, when I learn how to strive, that I forget my basic and utter dependence on my Father for all of my life and grace. ... Let me be always listening, listening for the quiet voice of Your Spirit. Let me search for You in the Scriptures. Let me see Your glory everywhere in the earth that You have made. Let me be always open and anticipating until that sunburst day when You come to find me."(pp.139-140)

This little book makes a unique contribution to our devotional understanding of our own selves when still in the womb where God's own image and likeness was worked into us, you and me, individually. It is a pity this beautiful book is now out of print. This review is written primarily to preserve its most inspiring passages for more readers.

-- Reviewed by Ellen Myers

Clip and mail to:

CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

- ☐ Enclosed is my payment of \$15* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's *Statement of Belief*:
1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
 2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
 3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
 4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP _____

*(\$20 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

- ☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSHs Quarterly**.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ ZIP _____

EDITORIAL	1
LETTERS	3
ANNOUNCEMENTS	
The World Council of Churches and Evolution	4
The Pascal Centre for Advanced Studies in Faith & Science ..	6
CREATION, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE HISTORY OF "UNALIENABLE RIGHTS"	
Gary T. Amos: <i>Defending the Declaration</i>	7
CREATION, KINGDOM, HOME	
Ellen Myers	15
THE SCHOOL - A RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FAMILY	
Jean-Marc Berthoud	19
OBSERVATIONS AND PERSPECTIVES ON HOME EDUCATION	
Samuel Peavey	23
BOOK REVIEW	
Judith Miles, <i>Journal from an Obscure Place</i>	30

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 929
--

MO ASSN FOR CREATION 991
405 N SAPPINGTON RD
GLENDALE MO 63122